

Remarks

Claims 10-46 are pending in this application. Claims 10-14, 16, 17, 20-24, 26-29, 31, 32, 35-40, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chambers (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,485). Claims 15, 30, 33, 34, 41, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers in view of Matsuda (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,116). Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers in view of Matsuda and further in view of the admitted prior art. Claims 18, 19, 44, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers in view of Matsuda and further in view of Moriarty (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,744). The invention is believed to be patentable.

Claim 10, for example, recites a method of distributing high-speed information packets to at least one subscriber unit. Each information packet is associated with an information channel. The method comprises routing each information packet through a distributed network of routing elements. Each routing element is in wireless communication with at least one other routing element in the network of routing elements. The method further comprises receiving each information packet in a distribution center in communication with the distributed network of routing elements. The method further comprises forwarding each information packet to each subscriber unit in communication with the distribution center and requesting the information channel of which the information packet is associated.

Put another way, claim 10 involves distributed routing in a wireless communication distributed network wherein the routed information packets are received in a distribution center for forwarding to subscriber units requesting the associated information channel.

Chambers is far different than the claimed invention. Chambers does describe a low power microcellular wireless drop interactive network. In more detail, Chambers discusses shortcomings of multi-channel multi-point distribution service (MMDS) and local

multi-point distribution systems (LMDS). Chambers discusses using lower power microcellular wireless drops for the “last mile” of signal distribution. That is, Chambers attempts to bring together the advantages of MMDS systems and LMDS systems by providing a “last mile” solution using low power microcellular wireless drops. However, prior to the “last mile,” Chambers may simply use a conventional hybrid fiber coax network as stated in column 3, at lines 15-18.

On the other hand, the subject matter of independent claim 10 does involve forwarding information packets to subscriber units; however, claim 10 specifically recites a distribution method involving information packet routing through a distributed network of routing elements, with each routing element in wireless communication with at least one other routing element. Chambers makes no suggestion of the claimed combination including the distributed wireless communication routing network recited by claim 10. After all, Chambers only discusses wireless drops for the “last mile,” and states that the infrastructure may be similar or identical to the layout of the conventional hybrid fiber coax network.

In making this rejection, with regard to the claimed routing elements, the Examiner makes reference to elements 14 in Chambers. Reference number 14 does designate a remote node transceiver; however, the remote node transceiver merely converts the modulated and channelized combined optical signal to an electrical RF signal and broadcasts the RF signal to a number of subscribers. (Col. 3, ll. 18-24.)

The Examiner has relied on Chambers in rejecting each independent claim, namely, claims 10, 20, 28, 31, and 36.

Regarding claim 20, claim 20 recites a system for providing high-speed packetized information comprising a distributed routing network. Each distribution point in a plurality of distribution points is in radio contact with at least one other distribution point in the plurality of distribution points. At least one of the distribution points comprises a host

digital terminal for converting high-speed information packets to an optical format and forwarding the information packets to the subscriber units.

In this way, the HDT converts the information packets to the optical format for forwarding along the last leg to the subscriber units. Similar to claim 10, claim 20 specifically recites the distributed routing network including the plurality of distribution points with each distribution point in radio contact with another distribution point. As explained above, Chambers makes no suggestion of such a distribution network.

Independent claim 28 recites a system for providing packetized video information to a plurality of subscriber units, and specifically recites distribution points in radio contact with each other and forming a distributed routing network. Chambers makes no suggestion of the claimed distributed routing network. Chambers only describes remote node transceivers that convert the modulated and channelized combined optical signal to an electrical RF signal, while describing the remainder of the infrastructure as a conventional HFC network as opposed to a distributed wireless routing network as claimed.

Independent claim 31 recites a system including a distributed routing network comprising a plurality of distribution points in radio contact with each other, and is also believed to be patentable for reasons given above.

Independent claim 36 recites a system for distributing high-speed information packets to at least one subscriber unit. According to claim 36, a distributed network of routing elements routes each information packet, and each routing element is in wireless communication with at least one other routing element in the network of routing elements. Similar to the other independent claims, this claim recites a combination of specific features including the distributed wireless communication routing network and is also believed to be patentable.

Again, Chambers only describes wireless drops for the last mile of distribution, and offers no discussion, teaching or suggestion of a wireless communication distributed routing network as specified in each independent claim, but only describes a conventional HFC network using low power micro-cellular wireless drops for the last mile to the subscribers.

The remaining claims are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable for the reasons given above. In rejecting some of the claims, the Examiner has relied on various secondary references. The shortcomings of the primary reference, Chambers, are not overcome by any of the secondary references.

Claims 10-46 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$120 is enclosed to cover the Petition fee. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

ANGUS O. DOUGHERTY ET AL.

By Jeremy J. Curcuri
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 27, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351